

REMARKS

ON THE

ERRONEOUS IMPRESSIONS AND SPIRIT OF
HOSTILITY AT PRESENT EXISTING,

MORE ESPECIALLY AMONGST THE RELIGIOUS PUBLIC,

IN REGARD TO

THE DIFFUSION OF SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE IN
GENERAL, AND OF PHRENOLOGY AND ITS
SUPPOSED EFFECTS IN PARTICULAR.

BY H. G. WRIGHT.

EDINBURGH :

JOHN ANDERSON JUN. 55. NORTH BRIDGE STREET;
LONGMAN & CO., AND SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO., LONDON.

MDCCCXXXVI.

Price Twopence.

REMARKS.

WERE phrenologists to consider it necessary to answer every ephemeral objection that is hazarded against their science, the task might be an endless one. But when from time to time arguments of seeming weight are adduced,—although of *seeming* weight only,—it is befitting to give the world assurance of its power, by shewing how little ground there really is for such objections. It appears to me that this might be advantageously done at present, when there exists, more particularly among the religious instructors of the community, a very erroneous impression of, and consequent spirit of hostility towards, the doctrines of Phrenology.

An idea has got abroad that science aims at usurping the place of Christianity. Not only is this heard in conversation, but, in a printed Prospectus recently issued, intimating the proposed establishment of a religious periodical, under the name of the “Scottish Christian Herald,” the following passages occur:—“All sorts of literary machinery, newspapers, lectures, treatises, magazines, pamphlets, school-books, libraries of knowledge for use or for entertainment, are most diligently and assiduously set in motion, if not for purposes *directly hostile to the Gospel*, at least on the theory that men may be made good and happy without the Gospel, *nay though the Gospel were forgotten as an old wives’ fable* ;” and the writer, after enumerating the facilities and resources now existing for disseminating knowledge, says, that religion should be “going forth in the might of the Lord to meet the gigantic foe on the very terms of his own challenge. She may not indeed adopt his unholy spirit, but righteously she may wield his own weapon for consummating her godly triumph.”

Whilst every well-wisher to the great cause of human improvement must rejoice in the establishment of a work promising to be productive of much good, it is certainly to be regretted that it should have been heralded in such a jealous, grudging spirit. It is not my intention or object, however, to offer any farther remarks on this prospectus than are rendered necessary by its relation to the subject in hand; and I shall therefore confine myself at present to pointing out the extraordinary, though, as it appears to me, strictly legitimate, consequence to which one of the passages leads. The writer states that religion should be going forth "in the might of the Lord," to attack the "gigantic foe," viz. the teachers and the taught—the authors and their works. Now it is obviously implied here, that the directors of "all sorts of literary machinery," and the pupils, are proceeding "in the might of"—*the devil*—for there is no medium—they must be serving either God or Mammon; and thus we have the "father of lies" in the somewhat novel and anomalous situation of lending his powerful aid in spreading the truths of science, and inculcating the beauty of morality and religion! Let us follow out the writer's idea, and imagine the people acting up to what the "unholy spirit" teaches them, viz. that the Creator having bestowed upon them faculties, the fruits of which are benevolence, justice, integrity, &c., it becomes an imperative duty, dictated by Nature and enforced by Christianity, to keep these faculties in habitual action. What would be the result? Why, according to the prospectus, these unfortunates, being under an "infatuation," would be doomed to follow their arch-instructor to the regions below; and we should thus have the curious spectacle of the place of the wicked being occupied by highly moral beings. This, I suspect, would be carrying the millenium considerably beyond what even its most sanguine advocates have imagined possible. Let it not be thought that this is meant in any profane spirit. If the conclusion at which we are arrived be rather startling, it is at least a fair deduction from the premises laid down in the prospectus.

When I saw at the head of the list of those individuals who cordially approved of the design stated in the prospectus, the name of the Reverend Dr Chalmers, I could not help feeling very considerable surprise, that a writer who had entertained

the sentiments stated below,* who had deprecated that “ narrow, exclusive, and monopolizing spirit,” which he feared was “ too characteristic of the more declared professors of the truth as it is in Jesus ;”† and who had subsequently borne testimony to the beneficial effects flowing from the rapid progress of education ;—I say I did feel considerable surprise, that this very writer should view the diffusion of intellectual and moral knowledge as bordering upon hostility to the Gospel ! When such a view is entertained, there must be some strange misapprehension as to the nature and tendencies of the knowledge alluded to. But, I would ask, in what respect do the lectures, treatises, school-books, and other means of diffusing knowledge above mentioned, differ from all former lectures, treatises, school-books, &c., which were never, so far as I know, objected to by the clergy ? Are the lectures of Dr Hope, and Professors Wilson and Jameson, in the College, less “ hostile to the Gospel,” than those given by Dr Fyfe, Mr Combe, and Professor Nichol, in the Waterloo Rooms ? Is there some latent poison lurking in the words of the latter ? Does some moral Upas tree grow in these rooms, making the atmosphere fatal to all who breathe it ? Or is it the Philosophical Association that, like a modern Cerberus, with its three lecturers for its mouths, “ *tria guttura pandens*,” indicates the proximity to Pandemonium ?

“ Cerberus hæc ingens latratu regna trifauci
Personat ? ”

Or does Mr Simpson hold up some Gorgon’s head, converting the hearts of all who enter the Cowgate Chapel into stone ? The lecturers and authors of the present day, as well as of the past, profess to expound the great laws by which the universe is governed. Where, then, lies this moral difference ?

* “ Those narrow and intolerant professors, who take an alarm at the very sound and semblance of philosophy, and feel as if there were an utter irreconcilable antipathy between its lessons on the one hand, and the soundness and piety of the Bible on the other. It were well, I conceive, for our cause, that the latter could become a little more indulgent on this subject ; that they gave up a portion of those ancient and hereditary prepossessions which go so far to cramp and enthrall them.”—*Preface to Dr Chalmers’s Astronomical Discourses.*

† Discourse I. p. 20. 8th Edition.

But, perhaps, though not said in so many words, the anathema may be intended to be launched principally at Phrenology, and its superstructure of Moral Philosophy ; and it may not be unreasonable therefore to examine the grounds on which the false impressions on this subject rest. But, before doing so, I should wish briefly to notice the effect which has actually been produced on the human mind, so far as regards the spirit of Christianity, by the dissemination of mere “ secular knowledge.”

It has often been lamented, that, down to the nineteenth century, the spirit of Christianity should have made comparatively so little progress. Whence was this? it was asked. One answer indeed was always ready—Because the human heart was “ desperately wicked.” But this left the inquirer exactly where it found him, so far as any practical purpose was concerned. We therefore still ask, Whence is this? In vain have we looked for any tangible reply until Phrenology solved the problem, by pointing out in a plain intelligible manner the true ultimate cause. What that cause was will immediately appear.

Religion produces its effects—lovely or terrible—according to the objects upon, and means by which, it acts. We see how a barbarous and warlike age conceived itself to be promoting Christianity in its true spirit by bloody crusades ; how, more recently, men thought they did God service by torturing and destroying their fellow-creatures for their conscientious opinions ; and how, in still later times, ministers of the reformed religion—ministers of the religion of peace and good-will—were the foremost to doom unfortunate wretches to the flames, from the horrible, though unquestionably sincere, belief that they were interpreting God’s message to man in its genuine sense. How is it that we now look back upon these dark pages in the history of religion with such very different feelings? Christianity had been preached, and was well known for centuries. Its ministers were bold and able men, conscientiously desirous to seek the truth “ as it is in Jesus.” The contents of the Bible—the grand depository of that truth—were as well known, and, generally speaking, it is admitted, much better than now. Men gave you chapter and verse for all they did. How, then, is it to be accounted for that the spirit and temper in which Christianity is now interpreted are so much improved? If the mind sees

things in so very different a manner, and if the things seen remain unchanged and unchangeable, must not the mind or its medium of vision be altered? But what has made this alteration? I reply, the progress, the diffusion of secular knowledge—that is, of science. But it may be asked, How is this shewn? In what way has science done this? Let Phrenology now tell.

Often as the fact has been stated, proved, and urged as a proved and therefore practical truth, that the mind acts through a material medium, it seems to me that this great truth has made little or no impression on that part of the community denominated the religious public; at least it has been received merely as an isolated fact, and not as one from which the most important results flow. They look at it as the world would have looked at the apple falling from the tree under which Sir Isaac Newton sat; but they do not, in the spirit of that great man, seize upon it as a key to the most splendid consequences. I must therefore beg leave, once more, to point to this fact as a grand fundamental practical truth, with which those who question the tendencies of Phrenology cannot be made too familiar. But let it not therefore be imagined, as has been often most unphilosophically done by many, that phrenologists believe matter to be mind. About as logical would it be, to say that philosophers believe the conductor to be the electric fluid. The mind itself remains as much a mystery as ever. We have but discovered the conductors by which its electric powers are made to appear; and we have found that, according to the perfect or imperfect state of these conductors, is it enabled to exhibit these powers and receive its impressions. Now, every tyro in Phrenology knows how the relative proportions of the organs of the mind are, in the course of time, and agreeably to an invariable law of Nature, capable of being changed according to the kind of education and training which they undergo. He knows that the organs of the intellectual and moral faculties, under the stimulus of increasing knowledge, in obedience to this law, gain in strength and volume; whilst the organs of the propensities, under whose tyrannical impulses men, as we have seen, committed the greatest atrocities, lose what the higher faculties gain, and of course, from the converse reason, that, owing to the mind being engrossed with objects of a higher nature, these organs are

deprived of the food which formerly kept them in so rampant a condition. Now, that this has actually been the case in highly civilized nations is a fact well known to phrenologists, and hence we are able to see in an intelligible manner how mere "secular knowledge," by thus improving, both positively and negatively, the medium through which religion acts on the mind (or, to recur to our former expression, by improving the mind's eye), has enabled us to view the spirit of Christianity in a totally different light from what our unenlightened ancestors did, and ignorant and barbarous nations still do.

Many who have not been accustomed to consider the moral man as so intimately connected with, and dependent upon, the physical man, may perhaps feel their prejudices shocked with the doctrine of the mind being made to act in so mechanical a manner; but let them steadily continue to investigate the truth—let them consider how fruitless have been the repeated attempts to civilize many savage tribes and nations, or to engraft the mild precepts of Christianity on their ferocious natures. I would, in particular, point to the case noticed by Mr Combe in his "Constitution of Man."* From this case it appears, that Mr Timothy Flint, a Presbyterian clergyman, after passing ten years amongst the savage tribes near the Mississippi, endeavouring by all means in his power to christianize them, at last gave up the task as totally hopeless, concluding with these remarkable words: "It strikes me, that Christianity is the religion of civilised man; that the savages must first be civilised; and that, as there is little hope that the present generation of Indians can be civilised, there is but little more that they will be christianized." Now, I would say, let the inquirer or the doubter compare the character of such savage tribes with the development of their brain in the phrenological museum; let him contrast it with that of the most moral and intellectual nations; and perhaps that examination will do more to remove prejudices than volumes of argument.

If, then, we have been so deeply indebted to general knowledge for the progress of true religion, with what intense interest ought we to regard that science, which—pointing to masses of every species of evidence, dead and living—professes to have

* Henderson edition, p. 198.

discovered and laid open the organ by means of which the Creator has made the human mind to act ; a science by which we are taught that the comparatively slow progress of the mind hitherto is clearly attributable to the component parts of this system being unequally balanced ; and which, lastly, puts it in our own power gradually to bring all these component parts to their proper relative proportions, and thus give to Christianity a higher and more extended sphere of action, precisely as the physician, from his knowledge of the anatomy and functions of the stomach, can apply to it such means as will place it in the most favourable condition for digesting and assimilating the food most proper for it. But who would dream of saying that the physician was therefore “ hostile ” to the best food being given, or that he treated the idea of food “ as an old wives’ fable ” ? Such, then, being the nature and tendency of Phrenology, is it not well worth while, nay, does it not become the duty of those who undertake to instruct the human mind, to inquire whether this discovery, pregnant with such important consequences to man, really is consistent with truth ?

It has been objected, that it cannot be true, because its doctrines are inconsistent with Revelation. Now, assuming for argument’s sake that this is true (though, in point of fact, it is totally unfounded), if the world at large will listen to and be satisfied with this objection, that may be sufficient, for the present at least, without going into the subject itself. But if, on the other hand, as is actually the case, the world are determined not to judge by apparent inferences, but to examine the matter on its own merits ; if they think they see evidence of its truth, and persist in believing and acting upon it despite all denunciations, then possibly the objectors may exclaim, “ If the world will bow down to idols, notwithstanding all our admonitions, let it do so.” But we would ask, Is this not virtually confessing that the great object for which the church exists has failed ? The objectors, therefore, are in duty bound to look closely into the subject themselves. It is not sufficient that they think it untrue through inference. They must dispel the people’s delusions—they must prove to them where the fallacy lies, and thus check them in their *ignis fatuus* chace. If the theory propounded by phrenologists be a false deduction from the evi-

dence founded on, or if that evidence be unsound or insufficient, by all means let it be exposed and rejected, as “science falsely so called.” But if, upon investigation, the system be found to rest upon a rock, then, instead of wasting time in the hopeless task of trying to undermine it, or obstruct its progress by exciting ignorant prejudices against its supposed tendencies, let them acknowledge its truth, and make it subservient to moral and religious purposes.

But the objection with some is, that “Phrenology at best is but the wisdom of this world, which is foolishness,” and that the cultivators of science are (to recur to the words of the prospectus) only “men of this generation.” Very few words will suffice to shew the value of this objection.

“The wisdom of this world” must obviously mean something opposed to permanent wisdom,—sound knowledge,—happiness. When Christ speaks of the children of this world as contrasted with the children of light, he very plainly means, and in fact names, the avaricious, the covetous, the hypocritical,—men whose whole souls are engrossed with the cares of amassing wealth, “*quocunque modo rem*”—men, in short, who are systematically obeying the lower propensities of their nature. Does any rational man for a moment believe that our Saviour alluded to those who were then, or might thereafter be, engaged in studying the works of God, and endeavouring to unfold to the world the profound wisdom and goodness displayed in them, and their admirable adaptation to increase the comforts, and promote the civilization and happiness of man? Such knowledge was, and is, and ever will be, power—power for good—power to elevate the moral and intellectual nature of man—as indeed we have already shewn to have been actually its effect on the world. This assuredly, then, could never be branded as “foolishness ;” whereas the vices and follies enumerated by our Saviour, were in the truest sense foolishness, as being a breach of the great moral law, and, as such, certain to bring down the punishment of disobedience on the head of the offender. Nay further, Christ himself in some measure recommends the study of nature to us, when he holds up to our admiration the beauty of the lily of the field : and surely no one who knows even the elements of vegetable physiology will maintain that the unin-

formed admirer of the flowers of a thousand fields can have so high a perception of the exquisite structure of all their parts, as he who has pondered over their wondrous powers and resources. If, then, the study of nature is praiseworthy—nay, is virtually commanded, since God has given us faculties expressly to investigate his works—surely it is somewhat unreasonable to term the discoverers or disseminators of knowledge, merely “men of this generation;” or to consider them as “gigantic foes,” whom religion ought “to be going forth in the might of the Lord” to attack. “Gigantic” they undoubtedly are; but for “*Foes*” we must beg leave to read *Friends* to religion, inasmuch as they are enlarging the field of action for its teachers. The lecturer on physical science stores the mind with a thousand proofs of the wisdom and goodness of the Creator. The expounder of moral philosophy points out the duties of man in his domestic and social capacity, and shews, in a simple and most satisfactory manner, how his mental constitution fits him as a moral and religious being, for believing and obeying the truths that Revelation unfolds, and which lie beyond the reach of reason. But although these teachers do from time to time lead the mind from nature up to nature’s God, yet it is more especially the privilege as well as duty of the religious instructors of man to apply this knowledge to its highest purposes. But if it is not laid hold of, and turned to the best account, is that the fault of the man of science? And what are we to think when the aid which science is thus rendering to religion is not only not taken advantage of, but is actually denounced as all but “directly hostile to the Gospel!” We must trust to time and further inquiry for removing these prejudices and inconsistencies.

But, says another class of objectors, “whether Phrenology is true or not, it is inconsistent with Revelation, and is therefore a dangerous study.” What! the natural and written revelations of God inconsistent with each other! Is this seriously maintained? Impossible, surely!—Can the Deity contradict himself?—Can the Being that inhabiteth eternity, unchangeable as that eternity—can He pronounce the works of his hand to be “good,” and send a revelation to man denouncing them as dangerous? Can He unrol

them to our wondering eyes, as displaying his wisdom and benevolence, and then proclaim that we must not look upon them? No! it is not God that forbids this, but man, poor fallible man. We all remember how similar objections were brought forward when geology was first placed on the basis of science.* Its doctrines were denounced by that "narrow spi-

* These objections still continue to be urged. The Quarterly Review for April 1836 contains the following forcible remarks (p. 31). "As this unfounded prejudice (that the facts taught by Geology tend to weaken the belief in revealed religion) has, to a considerable extent, been a stumbling-block in the way of those who would otherwise have been led to delight and instruct themselves by geological research, the Canon of Christchurch, rightly, we think, attacks it on the threshold of his work. Its origin he traces to a misconception of the meaning of the terms employed in the Mosaic narrative of the creation, from which it has been unwarrantably inferred that the existence of the universe, as well as of the human race, dates from an epoch of about six thousand years ago. Now there is no question whatever that this notion has been utterly disproved by the discoveries of geology, which demonstrate the surface of our planet not merely to have existed, but to have undergone physical changes very similar to those which affect it at present, and to have been quietly and happily tenanted by a long succession of living creatures, vegetable as well as animal, for countless ages before the epoch from which our scriptural chronology dates, and which was signalized by the first appearance of man.

"Whatever difference of opinion may still exist among geologists on other points, *this* is a truth (as Dr Buckland remarks) admitted by *all* observers;—as firmly established, indeed, and on as immoveable evidence, as the Copernican system, the theory of gravitation, or any other of the fundamental doctrines of science. Well, then, what follows? Is it wise to endeavour to shirk this established truth—to shut our eyes to it—to avoid the science which teaches it, and thus encourage the foolish and false notion, that there is any thing in it at variance with Scripture? Surely this would be the way to produce the very evil that is dreaded, the undermining of the faith of many in revelation. On the contrary, if, dismissing the vague ideas on cosmogony they have derived from too literal an acceptance of our necessarily imperfect translation, these timid and unwise friends of revelation will confront the Bible itself with the admitted geological facts, they will satisfy themselves that the inconsistency they have assumed is entirely fanciful. But, in the first place, what reason have we to expect to find in the Bible a revelation of geological or other phenomena of natural history, wholly foreign to the object of a volume intended only to be a guide of religious belief and moral conduct? Dr Buckland justly asks, at what point short of a communication of Omniscience, could such a revelation have stopped, without imperfections similar in kind to that which they impute to the existing narrative of Moses." After all efforts to arrest the progress of Phrenology, by denouncing it as at variance with Scripture, have failed, we shall probably

rit" which Dr Chalmers has so justly stigmatised. Its discoveries were declared to be subversive of the Mosaic account of the creation, and to set aside the authority of Scripture. Well, what was the result? Why, men were resolved to judge of the matter upon its own merits; they examined the facts adduced, were convinced by the volumes of evidence brought forward, of the truth of geology, and, as a consequence, felt (to use the mildest expressions) a diminution of respect for their religious teachers, as endeavouring, from an unenlightened adherence to their own "narrow, exclusive, and monopolizing" views and interpretations, to stem the progress of knowledge, and as shutting their eyes to the development of the great truths which time is unfolding. What could be more fatal to the influence of those who ought ever to be the calm and candid investigators of all evidence, on whose unprejudiced minds the rising sun of truth should first dawn, than to refuse to look at that glorious light, and yet proclaim that what the world hailed as the sun, was no sun at all, but could only be, at best, some collection of luminous vapours? Nay, what could be more prejudicial to religion itself, which was thus made to appear in opposition to what men firmly believed to be the true interpretation of the works of God's hand? And such will again be the result if these men once more obstinately oppose themselves to the progress of truth. It is in vain to say that Phrenology, if true, is dangerous: truth cannot be dangerous; error only is so. The only question then to be asked is, Is it true? and if this be satisfactorily proved, let them hail it as a *divine truth*, let them feel assured that it must be consistent with Scripture rightly interpreted. It is the particular interpretation, then, that has been put upon parts of Scripture that must be examined; and if, upon investigation, it be found that certain passages have been understood in a literal sense, where the great commentary of nature, in other words, the works of God, indicate a metaphorical to be the true one, (as in the case of the creation illustrated by geology), let them at once come

have arguments in abundance proving the harmony of the two. It would surely be more profitable to begin by trying to discover this concord, than to end by doing so, only after Religion has been brought into a rude and uncalled for collision with Philosophy.

forward, as worshippers at the shrine of truth, and boldly proclaim, that what man in his ignorance had called a literal day, the Eternal has, by his works, declared to be a thousand years, both in his sight being alike. In such a spirit as this, by a willingness to believe all science to be in harmony with revelation, what beneficial results might we not anticipate for religion, when men saw that it did not run counter to what they all felt to be true, and that its professors, instead of attempting to extinguish the torch of science, held it boldly up, to add its "confirmation strong" to the grand truths of Scripture, whilst its light enabled them to define those minor features whose details had been hitherto somewhat obscure. How differently would religion then be regarded by thinking men.

If this be true of geology, or of science in general, how pre-eminently is it so of Phrenology—a science which lays bare the chords by which the human mind sends forth its harmonies and its discords—a science which enables us to attune those chords so nicely, that the breath of Christianity in passing over them may hereafter draw forth their tones in richest unison; a consummation how devoutly to be wished! When we withdraw our eyes from this glorious prospect and turn them back upon the past, does it not appear wonderful that a discovery, professing to confer upon us the power of working such changes and improvements on the human mind, should have been frowned upon, and scouted as the enemy of man's best interests? Great, indeed, is the power of prejudice; but greater still is the power of truth, and though it may work its way imperceptibly, advance it must in spite of all impediments.

Many may be disposed to smile at all this as utopian. These are not the days, however, to rest satisfied with smiles. The human mind has been aroused from its long lethargic sleep, and feels an insatiable thirst for all sound knowledge; and if those who ought to bring all departments of it to aid in the great object of elevating our nature,—who should be all things to all men,—who, while they give milk to babes, should give meat to the strong,—if these declare that what the world finds upon trial to be "meat" is only poison, we must not be surprised that the world turns a deaf ear to them. But let us hope that the prejudice which has led to such opinions will soon disappear, and

that the time is approaching when sound knowledge of every kind will be hailed as the handmaid of religion.*

Are there any who still have lurking fears, that Phrenology usurps the place of Christianity, or treats the Gospel as “an old wives’ fable?” If so, let a short allegory in conclusion dispel their dread.

The human mind is a garden on which the sun of Christianity has been shining for centuries. The mental gardeners, unable to gain admission, or to see over the walls, were obliged to content themselves with throwing over the seed, some here and some there. They lamented that but a small portion sprung up and bore fruit. They presumed that something was wrong; but how could they remedy that something, while they were unable to perceive the real cause? Nay, even though they might guess its general nature, what the better were they? But now the key of Phrenology has thrown open the garden door, and lo! we have the cause lying palpably before our eyes. Here we see thorns running wild, which, being originally there, have been acted upon by that same sun, even to the detriment of the garden; and there we perceive the thin soil which was quickly exhausted, and could bring nothing to maturity. Now, the moral philosophy of Phrenology points out the implements by which we may cut down the thorns to their proper dimensions, and turn them to useful purposes, and by which we may gradually so deepen and improve the soil, that the sun may draw

* It is remarkable that while the prejudices alluded to in the text are so rife in the under current of private society, no *divine* has ventured, as far as I am aware, to support them by the authority of his name. Dr Chalmers’ Bridgewater Treatise runs parallel in its subject to Mr Combe’s Constitution of Man, yet although the latter work has been in the hands of the public since 1828, and Dr Chalmers published recently, he takes no notice of its existence; an omission not conceivable if he had regarded it as dangerous, and had been prepared to refute it. The late Dr Andrew Thomson was to some extent acquainted with Phrenology, and he survived the publication of the Constitution of Man for some years; yet although he was the editor of the Christian Instructor, a ready writer, and neither loth nor slow to attack error in every form, he never published a word against it. Even now, who among the clergy ventures his name and fame in the lists against Phrenology?—Not one. Every thinking man will infer from these facts, that it is assailed by mere blind prejudice, and by prejudice alone, which must yield to the progress of investigation and of reason.

from it thirty, sixty, or a hundred fold. But this is the work of time. The operations of nature are slow, and whether we are endeavouring to produce the fruits of the mind or of the earth, we must not expect miracles. It is our part to clear the ground. Succeeding generations will reap the fruits. To continue our allegory. Let us hope that the hitherto excluded mental cultivators will now take the advantage of the key thus offered, and walk round the garden, and, if they find all as we say, that they will lend their willing aid in bringing the mental mould into so high a state, that the sun of Christianity may at last draw forth such beauty and luxuriance as to picture to us a second garden of Eden.